

REMARKS

Claims 8, 20, 26, 28-30, 32-33 are in the application. No amendments are being made in this paper. Claims 8 and 20 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 8, 20, 26, 28-39, 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Buist reference.

As his reason for maintaining the present rejections, the Examiner states simply, “that the cited teaching reads on a workspace layout”. Applicants are somewhat perplexed by this statement, in that it is not clear what specifically the Examiner is referring to by the phrase, “the cited teaching”. Nevertheless, doing their best in view of the meagerness of the Examiner’s explanation, applicants have reviewed the previous Office Action (issued Jan. 9, 2008) and believe that the relevant portion thereof is found at the top of page 5.

In that portion of the 1/08 Office Action, the previous Examiner referred to the claim language at issue, more currently amended to remove “a type and form of information to be displayed”, and to require only at least one of “a workspace layout” and “a color scheme” to be included in user preferences stored in the second intermediate component. With respect to the prior version of this claim language, the previous Examiner quoted the following passage from Buist: “the system stores the user’s preferences on the replica server database...”. Rather unhelpfully, the previous Examiner also cited no less than 11 full columns of Buist’s disclosure. Nevertheless, applicants were able to find the quoted portion of Buist at column 24, lines 43-44. In fact, in the present posture of the case, it appears that the entire paragraph at column 24, lines 37-55 is pertinent to the Examiner’s position.

The previous Examiner took the position that the user’s watch list disclosed in Buist satisfied the formerly claimed “type and form of information to be displayed”. Now that applicants have removed that phrase, the present Examiner appears to go a step further (as applicants are forced to infer from the scantiness of the Examiner’s discussion), apparently holding that the watch list also “reads on” the claimed “workspace layout”. As to this point,

applicants must firmly part company with the present Examiner. The passage at Buist 24/43-44 is concerned with a user's watch list of securities, which has nothing to do with the claimed "workspace layout". It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's interpretation of "workspace layout" has gone outside of the realm of what is reasonable. For that reason, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the pending rejection. At a minimum, so that the case may be properly positioned for possible appeal, it is requested that the Examiner provide a more specific explanation of why he is maintaining the current rejection. Better than that, however, applicants hope the Examiner will recognize that his position is not well founded, and therefore will allow the claims.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,

September 5, 2008

Date

/Nathaniel Levin/

Nathaniel Levin

Registration No. 34,860

Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC

50 Locust Avenue

New Canaan, CT 06840

(203) 972-3460